

RECEIVED

2010 OCT -7 PM 4: 36 **FEC MAIL CENTER** 

**WASHINGTON HARBOUR** 3000 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007-5109 202,672,5300 TEL 202.672.5399 FAX

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

foley.com October 7, 2010

WRITER'S DIRECT LINE 202.295,4081 cmitchell@foley.com EMAIL

**CLIENT/MATTER NUMBER** 999100-0130

## VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Jeff S. Jordan, Esq. Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination and Legal Administration Federal Election Commission 999 E Street NW Waaizington, DC 20463

Re:

MUR 6371 - Our Country Deserves Better PAC /

TeaPartyExpress.org - Respondent

Dear Mr. Jordan:

Please find enclosed the Statement of Designation of Counsel of the undersigned to represent Respondent, Our Country Deserves Better PAC / TeaPartyExpress.org in the abovereferenced Matter Under Review.

Simply put, there is no evidence of a coordinated public communication in the instant case. The Complainant, the Republican Party of Delaware ("Complainant"), has alleged that Respondent's public solicitations for its PAC somehow exceed(ed) the contribution limits under the law. However, Respondent's solicitations referenced in the Complaint, as clearly seen from the exhibits attached to the Complaint, were all within the statutory limits for contributions to Respondent. As a federal multi-candidate committee, Respondent is permitted to solicit and receive up to \$5,000 from an individual during a calendar year. See 11 C.F.R. §110.1(d). That is exactly what the Respondent did. At no time has Respondent cour solitited more than \$5,000 from an incividual dunor, nor in there my evidence furnished by the Comminiment to demonstrate such a solicitation. And there is further up evidence that Rospontiant ever received more than \$5,000 fluor any individual donor. That information is all a matter of public record on the Respondent's filings posted on the FEC's website. See http://query.nictusa.com/ogi-bin/fecimg/?C00454074.

Thus, the allegation that Respondent solicited or received excessive contributions is groundless. Further, Respondent has never made a contribution to Friends of Christine O'Donnell, the principal authorized committee of Christine O'Donnell, Republican nominee for the United States Senate from Delaware. Respondent has maile independent expenditures in support of Christine O'Donnell and / or in opposition to her primary opponent Mike Castle. There is nothing in the law that precludes Respondent from spliciting contributions for the purposes of making independent expenditures. Compirisant's assertions to the contrary are without any fectual basis:

in/.



Mr. Jeff S. Jordan, Esq. October 7, 2010 Page 2

Complainant filed this complaint as a political ploy because Respondent disagreed with the Republican Party of Delaware's public endorsement and financial support of one of the Republican candidates before the primary in Delaware.

However, the enly evidence of "coordination" cited by Complainant is a surprise appearance by candidate Christine O'Donnell at an event sponsored by Respondent, at which Ms. O'Donnell appeared without the advance knowledge of the Respondent and publicly thanked Respondent for its suggest of her candidacy. Her other remodes were eli devoted to her plutfurm as a candidate. Such a tangential public appearance by the candidate at an event field to mobilize grassroots support for the O'Donnell candidacy where the only comments were to thank the organizers hardly constitutes a 'request, behest, suggestion' that the Respondent make the expenditures it had already determined to make in support of its endorsement of the O'Donnell candidacy. There are no facts to substantiate any 'closed door meetings' between O'Donnell and Respondent, as alleged by Complainant, because there were none. There have never been any meetings or conversations between O'Donnell or persons from her campaign and Respondent, other than the public appearance by O'Donnell at the Respondent's event. That single public appearance does not constitute material involvement by the O'Donnell campaign with Respondent regarding may of Respondent's activities.

Simply put, the Complaint is groundless and lacks any substantiating factual information because no facts exist that would constitute a coordinated public communication. The Complaint is wholly without merit and must be dismissed.

Please cantant me at (202) 295-4081 should you wish additional information. Thank

Sincerely.

Cleta Mitchell, Esq., Counsel
Our Country Deserves Better PAC /

Clife mickell

TeaPartyExpress.org

cc: Betty Presley, Treasurer

you.

**Our Country Deserves Better PAC** 

31

## RECEIVED 2010 OCT -7 PM 4: 36 FEC MAIL CENTER



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20468

## STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL Please use one form for each Respondent/Entity/Tressurer FAE(202) 210-3922

MUR #6371	•
NAME OF COUNSEL	: Clata Mitchell, Esq.
FIRM:	Poley & Lardner LLP
	Street, NV. Suite 600, Washington, DC 20007
TELEPHOI	#E- OFFICE ( 202 ) 295-4081
	FAX ( 202 ) 672-5399
•	
authorized to receive	med individual and/or firm is hereby designated as my counsel and is a any notifications and other communications from the Commission and efore the Commission.
•	
9-30-10 Bet	ty Premiey: Ortte Trully Transurer  pondunt/Agent -Signature Title(Transurer/Candidate/Owner)
	•
NAMED RESPONDENT: Our Country Deserves Better PAC/TesPartyExpress.org	
MAJLING ADDRESS: (Please Print)	30151 Thomas Street
	Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92668
TELEPHON	HOME
	USINESS ( 949 ) 858-7448
confidentially provisions of conducted by the Federal	i as part of an investigation buing conducted by the Federal Election Commission and the of 2 U.S.C. § 487g(a)(12)(A) apply. This section prohibits making public any investigation Election Commission without the express written consent of the paraces under

Investigation